

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

Patent Application of:

Lennart CHRISTENSSON et al.

Application No.: 10/561,181

Confirmation No.: 1971

Filed: May 22, 2006

Art Unit: 3634

For: SENSOR ARRANGEMENTS, SYSTEMS  
AND METHOD IN RELATION TO  
AUTOMATIC DOOR OPENERS

---

Examiner: J. REDMAN

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REVIEW**

**MS AF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Claims 1-8 and 15 are currently pending, of which claims 1 and 15 are independent.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1-8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spinelli and Diaz.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements in a sensor arrangement for controlling opening and closing of a door device, the sensor arrangement being arranged to be mounted in a vicinity of the door device, the sensor arrangement including “an image-acquiring means, which is arranged to be mounted in a viewing position wherein said image-acquiring means monitors a field of view that encompasses at least an approach area located adjacent said door device, said image-acquiring means being adapted to acquire images of said field of view,” “a movement detector, which is arranged to receive said acquired images and which is arranged to process the received images in order to detect a movement, which is to result in an opening of the door device,” and “an event generator, which is arranged to receive information regarding said door device and said field of view, said information comprising said acquired images, said event generator being arranged to process said information in order to identify at least one event according to predetermined criteria, said at least one event pertaining to exceptional situations

excluded from normal operation of said sensor arrangement, said exceptional situations being defined by said predetermined criteria, wherein the event generator creates a permanent recording of the event in response to an identification of the event, and wherein the event generator creates a temporarily buffered recording during normal operation of said sensor arrangement.”

As set forth above, independent claim 1 requires an event generator that is arranged to process information regarding the door device and field of view based on the acquired images from the image-acquiring means to identify at least one event pertaining to exceptional situations that are excluded from normal operation. That is the event generator determines whether an exception situation has occurred based on the acquired images.

In addition, the event generator creates a permanent recording of the event in response to an identification of the event, which pertains to exceptional situations, and creates a temporary buffered recording during normal operation.

Applicants submit that the combination of Spinelli and Diaz fails to render the claimed sensor arrangement unpatentable.

Spinelli relates to an automatic door assembly for installation at a doorway. The door controlling system includes a video imaging device mounted in a viewing position to monitor a filed of view that encompasses an approach area located adjacent to the doorway. The processor receives an internal video data signal from the imaging device and processes the information comprising the internal video data signal to determine whether a person or object has entered the approach area. The detection system transmits a door opening signal in response to the processor thereof determining that a person or object has entered the approach area. The door assembly also comprises a door operator connected to the door panel and communicated with the detection system. The door operator moves the door panel from the closed position thereof to the open position thereof responsive to receiving the door opening signal. See Abstract of Spinelli.

When it comes to storage of events, Spinelli discloses that the processor receives an internal video data signal from the imaging device and processes the information including the internal video data signal to determine whether a person or object has entered the approach area. The video data may then be stored in a video data storing device. See, for example, column 2, lines 27-31, column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 3, column 6, lines 35-36, and column 8, lines 28-30.

Spinelli also discloses that motion in an approach area of the door is detected by processing images from the video device. When it is determined that a person has entered an approach area, a door-opening signal is generated to open the door. Video data may be recorded and stored when motion is detected. See, for example, column 8, lines 17-20.

As noted by the Examiner, Spinelli fails to teach recording events that are “exceptional” and comparing these events with “predetermined/normal” criteria/events.

Based on the foregoing, Spinelli does not distinguish between “normal” events and “exceptional” events. Rather, for purposes of Spinelli, there is either an event of motion in an approach area or no event at all. In addition, Spinelli does not teach creating a temporary buffered recording as required by claim 1. Therefore, Spinelli cannot disclose that the event generator creates a permanent recording of the event in response to an identification of the event, and wherein the event generator creates a temporarily buffered recording during normal operation of the sensor arrangement.

In addressing these deficiencies of Spinelli, the Examiner has relied on Diaz as purportedly disclosing “a recorded image assembly having a VCR that permanently records ‘exceptional events’ (i.e., positive detection of metal) and normal events (i.e., no detection of metal) and upon comparing the different events an alarm is sounded (i.e., exceptional event) and if not, then the image is considered to be the base-line/normal image and no exceptional event is performed.”

Diaz relates to an access control chamber security system with a security chamber, see abstract. Particularly, the camera system (as shown schematically in FIG. 2) may include a camera installed at the entrance chamber, a time lapse security video recorder, and a monitor. See column 18, lines 4-13. The camera system is activated by the metal detector or by the control panel. If a signal is sent from the control panel or metal detector, the time lapse security VCR requests and receives an image from the camera. The time lapse provides the image to the video monitor.

Applicants note that the above referenced passage is the only passage of Diaz that relates to the operation of the VCR. From this passage it is clear that recordings are only performed if a signal is sent from the control panel or metal detector when metal has been detected. This is also evident from Fig. 8i which shows a block diagram setting forth the mode of operation of the

entrance chamber metal detector system as it interfaces with the camera system; if there is no alarm (item 560) there is no subsequent recording (item 561).

Clearly, Diaz fails to teach or suggest determining whether an exceptional event occurs based on acquired images. Diaz discloses determining whether an event occurs based on the detection of metal. In addition, Diaz fails to teach creating a temporary buffered recording during normal operation. Rather, Diaz discloses recording events only when metal is detected by the metal detector.

Therefore Diaz cannot disclose that the event generator creates a permanent recording of the event in response to an identification of the event, particularly based on acquired images, and wherein the event generator creates a temporarily buffered recording during normal operation of the sensor arrangement.

Because both Spinelli and Diaz fail to disclose an event generator that creates a permanent recording of the event in response to an identification of the event, and wherein the event generator creates a temporarily buffered recording during normal operation of the sensor arrangement, the combination of Spinelli and Diaz must necessarily fail to render all elements of independent claim 1 obvious.

Independent claim 15 recites a combination of elements in a sensor arrangement for controlling opening and closing of a door device, the sensor arrangement being arranged to be mounted in a vicinity of the door device, the sensor arrangement including “an image-acquiring means, which is arranged to be mounted in a viewing position wherein said image-acquiring means monitors a field of view that encompasses at least an approach area located adjacent said door device, said image-acquiring means being adapted to acquire images of said field of view,” and “an event generator, which is arranged to process information regarding said door device and said field of view in order to identify at least one event according to predetermined criteria, said at least one event pertaining to exceptional situations excluded from normal operation of said sensor arrangement, said exceptional situations being defined by said predetermined criteria, wherein the event generator creates a permanent recording of the event only in response to an identification of the event, said recording comprising at least one image of the field of view, and wherein the event generator creates a temporarily buffered recording during normal operation of said sensor arrangement.”

As noted above with respect to independent claim 1, both Spinelli and Diaz fail to disclose an event generator that creates a permanent recording of the event in response to an identification of the event, and wherein the event generator creates a temporarily buffered recording during normal operation of the sensor arrangement. Accordingly, the combination of Spinelli and Diaz must necessarily fail to render all elements of independent claim 15 obvious.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claims 1 and 15 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Spinelli and Diaz for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 2-8, Applicants submit that claims 2-8 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2-8 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Dated: June 8, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000